UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,807	11/26/2003	Juha Lehikoinen	037145-0201	8190

27433 7590 03/15/2006

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
321 NORTH CLARK STREET
SUITE 2800
CHICAGO, IL 60610-4764

EXAMINER	
FABER, DAVID	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/722,807	LEHIKOINEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Faber	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 November 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 November 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/26/2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the application filed on 26 November 2003.

This action is Non-Final.

2. Claims 1-36 are pending. Claims 1, 13, 27, and 32 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 26 November 2003 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

4. The drawings filed on 26 November 2003 have been accepted

Claim Objections

5. Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities:

6. In Claim 15, "critera" appears to be a typographical error. It is believed it should be "criteria."

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claims 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Section 2106 of the MPEP states:

(a) Functional Descriptive Material: "Data Structures" Representing Descriptive Material Per Se or Computer Programs Representing Computer Listings Per Se
Data structures not claimed as embodied in computer-readable media are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer. See, e.g., Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory.
Similarly, computer programs claimed as computer listings per se, i.e., the descriptions or expressions of the programs, are not physical "things." They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. Accordingly, it is important to distinguish claims that define descriptive material per se from claims that define statutory inventions.
Computer programs are often recited as part of a claim. Office personnel should determine whether the computer program is being claimed as part of an otherwise statutory manufacture or machine. In such a case, the claim remains statutory irrespective of the fact that a computer program is included in the claim. The same result occurs when a computer program is used in a computerized process where the computer executes the instructions set forth in the computer program. Only when the claimed invention taken as a whole is directed to a mere program listing, i.e., to only its description or expression, is it descriptive material per se and hence nonstatutory.
Since a computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer, the computer program itself is not a process and **Office personnel should treat a claim for a computer program, without the computer-readable medium needed to realize the computer program's functionality, as nonstatutory functional descriptive material. When a computer program is claimed in a process where the computer is executing the computer program's instructions, Office personnel should treat the claim as a process claim.** See paragraph IV.B.2(b), below. When a computer program is recited in conjunction with a physical structure, such as a computer memory, Office personnel should treat the claim as a product claim.

Since the claims lacks an explicit statement that the computer program product is embodied in computer readable medium, it is viewed as non-statutory

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 1, 2, 7, 10, 13, 14, 20, 22, 27, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Himmel et al (US Patent 6,408,316, patented 6/18/2002)

As per independent Claim 1, Himmel et al discloses a method comprising:

- Storing search criteria associated with a bookmarked Internet resource in a bookmark entry (e.g. Column 4, lines 53-56; Column 6, lines 53 – Column 7, line 3: Once search results have been acquired, the search results the user selects are made into bookmarks wherein the selected search results are incorporated into a bookmark page, where each bookmark is associated with descriptive text, keywords or abstract is presented.)
- Storing a resource attribute associated with the bookmarked Internet resource in the bookmark entry. (e.g. Column 4, line 53-54; Column 6, lines 13-15, 61-62: URL is saved to the bookmark entry)

As per dependent Claim 2, Himmel et al discloses a method further comprising:

- Storing a locator identifier associated with the bookmarked Internet resource in the bookmark entry. (e.g. Column 4, line 53-54; Column 6, lines 13-15, 61-62: URL is saved to the bookmark entry)

As per dependent Claim 7, Himmel et al discloses a method:

- Wherein the resource attribute further comprises a meta data of the Internet resource. (Column 4, lines 58-60: Discloses the default title tag used in HTML headers is used when descriptive text is unavailable.)

As per dependent Claim 10, Himmel et al discloses a method:

- locator identifier is a uniform resource locator. (URL). (e.g. Column 4, line 53-54; Column 6, lines 13-15, 61-62: URL is saved to the bookmark entry)

As per dependent Claim 13, Himmel et al discloses a device:

- computer including an Internet browser (FIG 1; Column 1, line 18)
- means for connecting the Internet browser to a search engine: (Column 5, lines 53-65)
- means for adding a bookmark entry, the bookmark entry having a resource attribute (e.g. Column 4, line 53-54; Column 6, lines 13-15, 61-62: URL is saved to the bookmark entry) and a resource search criteria associated with a bookmarked Internet resource. (e.g. Column 4, lines 53-56; Column 6, lines

53 – Column 7, line 3: Once search results have been acquired, the search results the user selects are made into bookmarks wherein the selected search results are incorporated into a bookmark page, where each bookmark is associated with descriptive text, keywords or abstract is presented.)

As per dependent Claim 14, Claim 14 recites similar limitations as in Claim 2 and is similar rejected under Himmel et al.

As per dependent Claim 20, Claim 20 recites similar limitations as in Claim 8 and is similar rejected under Himmel et al.

As per dependent Claim 22, Himmel et al discloses a device further comprises:

- personal computer (Column 3, lines 5-17: IBM PC series, a personal computer)

As per independent Claim 27, Claim 27 recites similar limitations as in Claim 13 and is similar rejection under rationale. Himmel et al discloses a system comprising:

- a first computer having a search engine (Column 5, lines 53-60: Discloses the use of a search engine on a server)

As per dependent Claim 31, Himmel et al discloses bookmark entry further comprising:

- a resource address (e.g. Column 4, line 53-54; Column 6, lines 13-15, 61-62: URL is saved to the bookmark entry. URL is an address.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 3, 15 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel et al (US Patent 6,408,316, patented 6/18/2002)

As per dependent Claim 3, Himmel et al discloses fails to specifically discloses the search criteria further comprise a selected text passage from the bookmarked Internet resource. However, Column 6, line 65 – Column 7, line 2, Himmel et al discloses descriptive text or information returned from the server such as an abstract or key words that can be included with the bookmark entry. In addition, user can enter text as the descriptive text therefore selecting text to be adding into the bookmark. (Column 4, lines 53-57)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel et al's method with the ability to determine which text is used in the bookmark entity since the ability would have provided the ability of flexibility and customability of creating a bookmark entry.

As per dependent Claim 15, Claim 15 recites similar limitations as in Claim 3 and is similar rejected under Himmel et al.

As per dependent Claim 28, Claim 28 recites similar limitations as in Claim 3 and is similar rejected under Himmel et al.

13. Claims 4-6, 11, 16, 18-19, and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel et al (US Patent 6,408,316, patented 6/18/2002) in further in view of Bharat (US Patent #6,810,395, filed 11/22/1999).

As per dependent Claims 4, 5, 6, and 11, Himmel et al fails to specifically disclose the search criteria comprises search terms from a search history file containing terms used in an Internet search engine, the resource attribute further comprising a resource name, and a creation or modification date, and the dynamic bookmark is a hypermedia link on a Internet resource. However, Bharat discloses the use of submitting a query to a search engine wherein search results return based on the query. (FIG 6) Each search result contains a title of the page, and a hyperlink containing the URL and the query terms used within the search. (FIG 8(a); Column 7, line 64 – Column 8, line 12) The user is able to save the 'lead' or bookmark that can include the query, title, URL, and the time at the event occurred (lead being saved, or one may say creation date) (Column 10, lines 55-61)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel et al's method with Bharat's method since Bharat's method would have provided of benefit of allowing a user to specify and use query-specific bookmarks.

As per dependent Claim 16, Claim 16 recites similar limitations as in Claim 4 and is similar rejected under Himmel et al and Bharat.

As per dependent Claim 18, Claim 18 recites similar limitations as in Claim 5 and is similar rejected under Himmel et al and Bharat.

As per dependent Claim 19, Claim 19 recites similar limitations as in Claim 6 and is similar rejected under Himmel et al and Bharat.

As per dependent Claim 29, Claim 29 recites similar limitations as in Claim 4 and is similar rejected under Himmel et al and Bharat.

As per dependent Claim 30, Claim 30 recites similar limitations as in Claim 11 and is similar rejected under Himmel et al and Bharat.

14. Claims 8, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel et al (US Patent 6,408,316, patented 6/18/2002) in further in view of Nielsen (US Patent 5,963,964, patented 10/5/1999) in further view of Hawkins(Hawkins, "EXIF.org," dated 10/5/2003)

As per dependent Claim 8, Himmel et al fails to specifically disclose the resource attribute further comprising EXIF data of the Internet resource. However, Nielsen discloses the ability to create a Visual Bookmark Image by taking a snapshot of the viewed web page. (Abstract; FIG 14)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Himmel et al's method with Nielsen's method since Nielsen's method would have provided the benefit that would have allowed the user to

view a bookmarked web page by selecting a visual bookmark of desired page from a plurality of visual bookmarks instead of making a selection from a list of web page titles.

However, Himmel et al and Nielsen fail to specifically disclose the image contains EXIF data. It was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that most images stored in a image compressed format such as a JPEG format. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have used JPEG to provide the benefit of reduced file size for quicker access and transmission over a network of a JPEG image.

In addition, Hawkins discloses the EXIF format is for storing interchange information in image files especially using JPEG compression. (pp 1) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel et al's and Nielsen's methods with EXIF.org's disclosure of EXIF since it would have provided the benefit of being used with JPEG compression that would allowed for smaller file size of the image.

As per dependent Claim 21, Claim 21 recites similar limitations as in Claim 8 and is similar rejected under Himmel et al, Nielsen, and Hawkins.

15. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel et al (US Patent 6,408,316, patented 6/18/2002) in further in view of Castro (Castro, "HTML for the World Wide Web with XHTML and CSS: Visual QuickStart Guide, 5th Edition", copyright 2003, pp 33-35)

Examiner provides the printout "HTML for the World Wide Web with XHTML and CSS: Visual QuickStart Guide, 5th Edition" from PeachPit Online Bookstore as evidence disclosing the book's publishing date is ***Sept. 17, 2002****.*

As per dependent Claim 9, Himmel et al fails to specifically disclose the resource attribute further comprises a file name associated with the Internet Resource. However, Castro discloses a (absolute) URL comprises a file name of the file itself. (pp 33-34)

It would have obvious been to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel et al's method with Castro's method since Castro's method would provided the benefit of knowing the exact location of a file within a URL.

16. Claims 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel et al (US Patent 6,408,316, patented 6/18/2002) (hereinafter known as Himmel '316) in further view of Himmel (US Patent #6,810,395, filed 11/22/1999) (hereinafter known as Himmel '360) in further view of Duri et al (US PGPub 2002/0156832, published 10/24/2002).

As per dependent Claim 12, Himmel '316 fails to specifically updating a bookmark associated with the bookmark Internet resource when the bookmarked Internet resource has changed being performing by the operations of: performing a search using the stored critera to obtain search results; comparing a resource attribute of resources from the search results from the performed search with the store resource attribute of the bookmarked Internet resource to obtain a matching resource having a

similar resource attribute, and storing a new locator identifier of the matching resource as a property of the dynamic Internet bookmark entry. However, Himmel '360 discloses comparing a title's and URL's of a bookmark entity and the visited site, and if a match between one of the two occurs, the referencing URL or the title is updated based on which attribute has changed. (Column 17, lines 40-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel '316's method with Himmel '360's method since Himmel '360's method would have provided of benefit of dynamically updating a designated bookmark in a browser.

However, Himmel '316 and '360 fail specifically to disclose performing a search using the stored critera to obtain search results. However, Duri et al discloses reading dynamic bookmark query attributes, stored in a bookmark shown in FIG 7, received in a request where a search is made based on the query attributes from the bookmarks. A search is conducted and the results are sent back to client. (Paragraph 0058)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel '316's and Himmel '360's method with Duri et al's method since Duri et al's method would have provided of benefit of a more effective method on managing bookmarks by dynamically updating using attributes.

As per dependent Claim 17, Claim 17 recites similar limitations as in Claim 12 and is similar rejected under Himmel '316, Himmel '360 and Duri et al.

17. Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel et al (US Patent 6,408,316, patented 6/18/2002) (hereinafter known as Himmel '316) in further view of Duri et al (US PGPub 2002/0156832, published 10/24/2002).

As per dependent Claims 23-26, Himmel et al fails to specifically disclose the computer comprises a mobile device and that the mobile device comprises a personal digital assistant, a mobile terminal, and a wireless access protocol enabled mobile phone. However, Duri et al discloses the client being of portable device taking the form of a personal digital assistant with wireless communications, or the client being a cellular phone that contains wireless communications. (Paragraph 0022) These mobile devices are clients to a server therefore act as a mobile terminal. (Paragraph 0023)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel et al's method with Duri et al's method since using a portable device such as a PDA would have provided the benefit being able to use dynamic bookmarks on a computer that isn't stationary.

18. Claims 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel et al (US Patent 6,408,316, patented 6/18/2002) (hereinafter known as Himmel '316) in further view of Himmel (US Patent #6,810,395, filed 11/22/1999) (hereinafter known as Himmel '360).

As per independent Claim 32, Himmel '316 discloses a computer program product with computer code comprising:

- Create a dynamic (Column 5, line 41, bookmark behavior can be set as dynamic) Internet bookmark for a bookmark Internet resource (FIG 3-4, Column 5, line 53 – Column 6, line 60)

However, Himmel ' 316 fails to specifically disclose update the dynamic Internet bookmark when the bookmark Internet resource has changed. However, Himmel '360 discloses a process when a dynamic bookmark is update by comparing a title's and URL's of a bookmark entity and the visited site, and if a match between one of the two occurs, the referencing URL or the title is updated based on which attribute has changed. (Column 17, lines 40-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel '316's method with Himmel '360's method since Himmel '360's method would have provided of benefit of dynamically updating a designated bookmark in a browser.

As per dependent Claim 33, Himmel '316 discloses a computer program product:

- Computer code to perform a search using a search criteria to obtain search results; (Column 5, line 53 – Column 6, line 10: Discloses searching using search text to obtain search results)

However, Himmel '316 fails to specifically disclose computer code comparing a resource attribute of resources from the search results from the performed search with the store resource attribute of the bookmarked Internet resource to obtain a matching resource having a similar resource attribute, and computer code to store a new locator identifier of the matching resource in the bookmark entry. However, Himmel '360

discloses comparing a title's and URL's of a bookmark entity and the visited site, and if a match between one of the two occurs, the referencing URL or the title is updated based on which attribute has changed. (Column 17, lines 40-67)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel '316's method with Himmel '360's method since Himmel '360's method would have provided of benefit of dynamically updating a designated bookmark in a browser.

19. Claims 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmel et al (US Patent 6,408,316, patented 6/18/2002) (hereinafter known as Himmel '316) in further view of Himmel (US Patent #6,810,395, filed 11/22/1999) (hereinafter known as Himmel '360) in further in view of Bharat (US Patent #6,810,395, filed 11/22/1999).

As per dependent Claim 34, Himmel '316 discloses a computer program product:

- Computer code to store a resource attribute associated with the bookmarked Internet resource in the bookmark entry. (e.g. Column 4, line 53-54; Column 6, lines 13-15, 61-62: URL is saved to the bookmark entry)
- Computer code to store a locator identifier associated with the bookmarked Internet resource in the bookmark entry. (e.g. Column 4, line 53-54; Column 6, lines 13-15, 61-62: URL is saved to the bookmark entry)

However, Himmel '316 and Himmel '360 fail to specifically disclose computer code to store a search critera associated with the bookmarked Internet resource in the

bookmark entry. However, Bharat discloses the use of submitting a query to a search engine wherein search results return based on the query. (FIG 6) Each search result contains the query terms used within the search. (FIG 8(a); Column 7, line 64 – Column 8, line 12) The user is able to save the 'lead' or bookmark that can include the query terms. (Column 10, lines 55-61)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel '316 and Himmel '360's method with Bharat's method since Bharat's method would have provided of benefit of allowing a user to specify and use query-specific bookmarks.

As per dependent Claim 35, Himmel et al discloses fails to specifically discloses the search criteria associated with a bookmarked Internet resource comprises a selected text passage from the bookmarked Internet resource. However, Column 6, line 65 – Column 7, line 2, Himmel et al discloses descriptive text or information returned from the server such as an abstract or key words that can be included with the bookmark entry. In addition, user can enter text as the descriptive text therefore selecting text to be adding into the bookmark. (Column 4, lines 53-57)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel et al's method with the ability to determine which text is used in the bookmark entity since the ability would have provided the ability of flexibility and customability of creating a bookmark entry.

As per dependent Claim 36, Himmel et al fails to specifically disclose the search criteria comprises search terms from a search history file containing terms used in an

Internet search engine. However, Bharat discloses the use of submitting a query to a search engine wherein search results return based on the query. (FIG 6) Each search result contains the query terms used within the search. (FIG 8(a); Column 7, line 64 – Column 8, line 12) The user is able to save the 'lead' or bookmark that can include the query terms. (Column 10, lines 55-61)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have combined Himmel '316 and Himmel '360's method with Bharat's method since Bharat's method would have provided of benefit of allowing a user to specify and use query-specific bookmarks.

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Himmel et al (US Patent #6,037,934): Discloses the use of updating dynamic bookmarks.
- Himmel et al (US Patent #6,211,871): Discloses the use of updating dynamic bookmarks.
- Himmel et al (US Patent #6,208,995): Discloses the use of updating dynamic bookmarks.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Faber whose telephone number is 571-272-2751. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8am to 430p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Faber
Patent Examiner
AU 2178

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER